



IFW

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re Patent Application of

Confirmation No. 8980

INOUE et al.

Atty. Ref.: 4034-21

Serial No. 09/810,466

Group: 2871

Filed: March 19, 2001

Examiner: Schechter, A.

For: LIQUID CRYSTAL DISPLAY DEVICE

\* \* \* \* \*

August 14, 2006

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

**STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW**

An Interview was conducted on July 25, 2006 for the above-identified application.


An Interview Summary reflecting the Interview on July 25, 2005 was given to the undersigned. During the interview it was argued that the Section 103(a) combination was legally flawed because the cited prior art teaches away from the alleged modification/combination. In particular, while Maekawa (US 6,164,785) discloses a high image clarity value, it teaches that high haze is a *problem* and that reduced haze values are desired (e.g., see Maekawa at col. 1, lines 45-50; and col. 7, lines 14-17). Thus, Maekawa teaches that high haze values are undesirable, thereby teaching away from the Section 103(a) combination/modification made by the Examiner. The remarks set forth in the July 11, 2006 amendment were also repeated during the interview.

Please advise if there should be any questions. It is believed that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. If any minor matter remains to be resolved, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned with regard to the same.

Respectfully submitted,

**NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.**

By: \_\_\_\_\_



Joseph A. Rhoa  
Reg. No. 37,515

JAR:caj  
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor  
Arlington, VA 22203-1808  
Telephone: (703) 816-4000  
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100